

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

By the present amendment, the specification has been amended to provide appropriate headings. Claim 22 has been canceled. Claim 25 has been amended to eliminate an alleged indefiniteness therein. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention. An Abstract has been added.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance, and Action to that end is respectfully requested.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing all of the features specified in the claims, pointing out that the features of claim 22 are not shown in the drawings.

As noted above, claim 22 has been canceled. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings became moot.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite, pointing out that the recitation of a trademark in a claim renders the claim indefinite. Claim 25 has been amended, as noted above, to substitute a specific material the trademark identifies for the trademark.

III. Rejection Over the Prior Art

The Examiner rejected Claim(s) 20, 21, 23, 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bozich U.S. Patent No. 3,485,472 (Bozich). Claims 22, 25, 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozich in view of, respectively; Morrison, U.S. Patent No. 3,885,769 (Morrison); Jones, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,992,818 (Jones) and Dougherty, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,950,986 (Dougherty). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-21 and 23-26 are patentable over the cited references.

The present invention relates to a method of rapid emptying of a supply line for coating units such as, e.g., supply line for lacquering units, and serves for the purpose of a necessary change, e.g., of one lacquer paint for another, to insure a

rapid and residue-free emptying of the supply line for the lacquer coating applying device.

This requires emptying of the supply line from its distal end (associated with the coating applying device to proximate end (adjacent to coating means storage). To solve this problem the invention proposes to reduce the cross-section over the entire length starting from distal end to the proximate end to zero by providing a valve device is arranged in the zone of the end of the supply line remote from the one or the plurality of containers, whereby impinging of the interstitial space is done with a pressure medium flowing in a direction opposite the direction of flow of the coating means at the time of application of the coating means.

It is respectfully submitted that the structure recited in claim 20 is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art, including Bozich.

Bozich does not disclose or even suggest arrangement of a valve at an end of supply line remote from the source of supply so that impinging of the interstitial space, with a pressure medium flowing in a direction opposite the direction of flow opposite the direction of flow of supply medium.

Bozich discloses a valve for connecting two sections of a conduit and including a flexible sleeve extending between the conduit sections. The valve is designed for controlling the flow between two conduit sections (column 1, lines 25-28). Bozich discloses and specifically claims the flow of collapsing fluid so that pressure forces act transverse to the direction of flow of the medium in the conduit. Clearly, Bozich discloses a completely different structure.

A rejection based on U.S.C. § 102 as in the present case, requires that the cited reference disclose each and every element covered by the Claim. Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, 32 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1017, 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1994); Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient Inc., 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1767-68 (Fed. Cir. 1987); Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Federal Circuit has mandated that 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires no less than “complete anticipation . . . [a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim (emphasis added).” (Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983); See also, Electro Medical Systems, 32 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 1019; Verdegaal Bros., 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 1053.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Bozich does not disclose a supply line as claimed. Since Bozich fails to disclose each and every feature of independent Claim 20, Bozich as a matter of law, does not anticipate the present invention, as defined by said independent claim.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Bozich discloses all of the elements covered by claim 20, the elements in Bozich are not arranged as in the claim.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Bozich does not anticipate or make obvious the present invention as defined in Claim 1, and the present invention is patentable over Bozich.

The secondary references, Morrison, Jones, and Dougherty likewise do not disclose the novel features of the present invention, as defined by claim 20. It is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 21 and 23-26 depend on claim 20 and are allowable for the same reasons claim 20 is allowable and further because of specific features recited therein which, when taken alone and/or in combination with features of claim 20, are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects, in order to place the case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction to be carried out by Examiner's amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Zinchuk

Alexander Zinchuk

Reg. No. 30,541

Date: April 6, 2006
Abelman, Frayne & Schwab
666 Third Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10017-5621
212-885-9383

This correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on April 6, 2006 in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label Number ER 059 675 728 US addressed to the Honorable Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Alexander Zinchuk
Alexander Zinchuk